

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-20 are pending.
Claims 1, 10 and 12 are amended.

No new matter is added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in paragraphs 0031-0033 of the published patent application (2005/0182666), for example.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application are requested based on the following remarks.¹

A. The 35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph, Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant traverses such assertion.

The Office Action asserts:

3. Claim 1 recites the limitations, "the rules engine determines whether each of the at least one data element has been fully validated as clean data", "the rules engine generates an exception task if it is determined that at least one data element is not clean", "the rules engine receives a resolution to the exception task, thereby enabling validation of the at least one data element". **All of the above limitations are directed towards method steps of performing the disclosed invention**, however, the other limitations establish a structure which infers that claim 1 is an apparatus. It is unclear as to whether claim 1 discloses a method or an apparatus (IPXL Holdings v. Amazon.com, Inc., 430 F.2d 1377, 1384, 77 USPQ2d 1140, 1145 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(MPEP 2173.05(p)). Claims 2-9 fail to cure the deficiencies of claim 1 and incorporate the same rejection and reasoning as claim 1.

¹ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., assertions regarding dependent claims, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references are legally combinable for obviousness purposes) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

(Emphasis added)

The Office Action appears to reject claim 10 on similar basis.

Applicant traverses the assertion that "All of the above limitations are directed towards method steps of performing the disclosed invention ...". Claim 1 sets forth various components of the claimed system, as well as processing that is performed by such components. Thus, claim 1 does not set forth a single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus (See *IPXL Holdings v. Amazon.com*).

However, in order to further satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to clarify that such claim is directed to a system.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 satisfies 35 U.S.C. 112 for similar reasons.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection is requested.

B. The 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed towards non- statutory subject matter based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, *In re Bilski* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 88 USPQ2d 1385.

The Office Action asserts:

... The machine-or-transformation test is a two-branched inquiry; an applicant may show that a process claim satisfies § 101 either by showing that his claim is tied to a particular machine, or by showing that his claim transforms an article. See *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 70. Certain considerations are applicable to analysis under either branch. First, as illustrated by *Benson* and discussed below, the use of a specific machine or transformation of an article must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope to impart patent-eligibility. See *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71-72. Second, the involvement of the machine or transformation in the claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity. See *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 590.

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

In paragraph 7, the Office Action further asserts "the methods recited in claims 12-17 are not tied to a machine nor transform the underlying subject matter to a different state or thing."

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicant submits that the claimed processing in conjunction with the "raw data database" and the "operational database" satisfy 35 U.S.C. 101. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and to further satisfy 35 U.S.C. 101, claim 12 is amended.

Applicant submits that claim 12 now clearly satisfies 35 U.S.C. 101. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is requested.

C. The Rejection of Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-12, and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,235,654 to Anderson *et al.* ("Anderson") in view of Scanlon (US 5,850,480). This rejection is traversed.

As articulated in the recent Federal Register guidelines:

Office personnel must provide an explanation to support an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. 35 U.S.C. 132 requires that the applicant be notified of the reasons for the rejection of the claim so that he or she can decide how best to proceed. Clearly setting forth findings of fact and the rationale(s) to support a rejection in an Office Action leads to the prompt resolution of issues pertinent to patentability. Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* Federal Register vol. 72, No. 195, Wednesday, October 10, 2007, page 57527.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present rejection fails to articulate sufficient findings of fact to support the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection. Applicant submits the rejection recites conclusory statements, which cannot sustain an obviousness rejection. See *In re Kahn*, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Applicant's basis for such traversal is set forth below.

The features of claim 1 are set forth in the listing of claims above. In particular, claim 1 recites:

a rules engine that **converts the documents into at least one data element** having a common format;

the rules engine determines whether each of **the at least one data element** has been fully validated as clean data;

the clean data is stored, by the system, in an operational database for use in application processing;

the rules engine generates an exception task if it is determined that at least one data element is not clean;

(emphasis added)

As referenced in the Office Action (paragraph 2) and as set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02(j), 35 U.S.C. 103 authorizes a rejection where, to meet the claim, it is necessary to modify a single reference or to combine it with one or more other references. M.P.E.P 706.02(j) indicates that after indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 103, the Examiner should set forth in the Office Action:

(A) the **relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon**, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate,

(B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s),

(C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and

(D) an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification.

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

M.P.E.P 706.02(j) references the well known requirements of *Graham v. John Deere*. Further, M.P.E.P 706.02(j) notes that it is important for an Examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the Applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.

Applicant submits that such analysis is not satisfied, so as to fairly support the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection. The basis of the rejection of claim 1 is set forth on pages 6-7 of the Office Action. In particular, the Office Action asserts:

4. As to Claim 1, Anderson teaches a system for routing and processing insurance related data (Anderson, Abstract and col. 8 lines 44-52), the system comprising:
 - a. a raw data database electronically storing insurance application related documents (Anderson, col. 3 line 63 to col. 4 line 19, the Examiner takes the position that the master machine generated data structure is equivalent to the raw data database);
 - b. a rules engine that converts the documents into **at least one data element** having a common format (Anderson, Fig. 4A, Fig. 7A-7E, col. 21 lines 25 to col. 22 line 13);
 - c. the clean data is stored in an operational database for use in application processing (Anderson, col. 3 lines 24-33, col. 33 lines 50-66);
 - d. the rules engine generates an **exception task** if it is determined that **at least one data element is not clean** (Anderson, col. 6 lines 56-63); and
 - e. the rules engine receives a resolution to the exception task, thereby enabling validation of the **at least one data element** (Anderson, col. 7 lines 2-13).

Anderson does not specifically disclose the rules engine determining whether each of the at least one data element has been fully validated as clean data. **Scanlon does teach the rules engine determining whether each of the at least one data element has been fully validated as clean data** (col. 31 lines 42-48 and col. 33 lines 16-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included fully validating each data element as clean data for the motivation for OCR error correction (Scanlon, Abstract).

(emphasis added)

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

As an initial matter, and regarding the alleged teachings of Anderson, as set forth above, the Office Action asserts "the rules engine generates an exception task if it is determined that at least one data element is not clean (Anderson, col. 6 lines 56-63)". However, based on a review of such disclosure of Anderson, Applicant submits that it is unclear what the Office Action interprets as teaching the claimed "exception task." Applicant notes that Anderson describes:

... In performing the character recognition process, the resultant coded data may contain errors which are **analyzed by the artificial intelligence error correction processor 28**, also shown in FIG. 1. The sequence of forms recognition and field extraction, yields the MGDS 50A, as is shown in FIG. 1A. The MGDS 50A is then transferred to the character recognition processor 26, along with the extracted field images 10". ...

(emphasis added)

However, from such disclosure, it is fully unclear what would constitute the claimed "exception task." Therein, for example, Anderson describes the "resultant coded data may contain errors which are analyzed by the artificial intelligence error correction processor 28..." However, such described analyzing may be performed in any of a wide variety of manners. Such described analysis of Anderson clearly fails to fairly teach the claimed "exception task" - so as to support the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

As a further deficiency, Applicant notes that claim 1 recites various processing associated with the claimed "at least one data element". The assertions in support of the rejection, as set forth above, allege manipulation by each of Anderson and Scanlon of such "data element." That is, for example, the Office Action asserts that Anderson teaches manipulation of such data element in clauses (b), (d) and (e), as set forth above. Further, the Office Action asserts that "Scanlon does teach the rules engine determining whether each of the at least one data element has been fully validated as clean data."

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

Thus, the Office Action appears, in such interpretation, to cast both Anderson and Scanlon as teaching such "at least one data element." However, Applicant submits that such interpretation clearly mischaracterizes the applied art and fails to fairly support the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

That is, as best understood, the Action appears to be attempting to interpret Anderson's "character" or "character position" as the claimed "data element." (see Anderson in column 7, lines 1-4). On the other hand, as best understood, the Office Action appears to be attempting to interpret Scanlon's "sub-string table" as the claimed "data element." (see Scanlon in column 31, lines 42-48 and column 33, lines 16-31).

As can be clearly appreciated, such parameters of Anderson vis-à-vis Scanlon are fundamentally different in nature. As a result, Applicant submits that it is a clear mischaracterization of the teachings (of the applied art) to interpret such parameters as constituting the claimed data element. Indeed, it is fully unclear how the described manipulation of Anderson's "character" or "character position" would be combined with the described manipulation of Scanlon's "sub-string table", i.e., so as to be workable in any manner.

Indeed, Applicant submits that to talk of such respective parameters of Anderson and Scanlon as akin (to each other) is nonsensical.

As a further point and relatedly (even above and beyond the "combination related" deficiencies described above), Applicant submits that Scanlon's "sub-string table" cannot fairly be interpreted as the claimed "at least one data element". That is, Applicant submits that Scanlon fails to support an interpretation that Scanlon's "sub string table" is validated as "clean data." The described processing of Scanlon is simply unrelated to such concept and/or such processing.

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that Anderson fails to support the applied rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Regarding independent claims 10, 12, 18, and 19, since these claims contain similar limitations as argued above with respect to independent claim 1, the same reasons apply to these independent claims.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 10, 12, 18, and 19, as well as dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13 17, and 20, are patentable over the applied art. Therefore, the undersigned representative will not address the arguments with respect to 3-9, 11, 14-17, and 20 and reserves the right to address these arguments at a later time. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 3-13, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

D. The Rejection of Claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of in view of Scanlon (US 5,850,480) in further view of the Office Action's alleged Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

As admitted in the Office Action, Anderson, *inter alia*, does not disclose the common format being extensible Markup Language. Office Action, p. 14. Rather the Office Action takes official notice for this element.

Applicant submits that the modification of Anderson, as proposed in the Office Action, fails to cure the deficiencies of the rejection, as discussed above. That is, Applicant submits that even if it were obvious to modify Anderson as asserted in the rejection of claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103, which is not admitted by Applicant, such would still fail to fairly teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Patent Application
U.S. Application No.: 10/777,634
Attorney Docket No.: 52493.000368

Since claims 2 and 13 are dependent on allowable claims 1 and 12, respectively, these claims are allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is requested.

E. Conclusion


For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: August 12, 2009


James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams LLP
1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 1700
McLean, VA 22102
Direct Dial (703) 714-7449
Main Dial (703) 714-7400